



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Five hundred Fellows. The Council would, therefore, suggest the desirability of not increasing the subscription or of making an entrance fee, until this number has been obtained. It will be readily seen that the objects of this Society include something more than those generally included in a scientific society, and that the expense of printing is very large. The Council are glad, however, to state that the present number of Fellows, two hundred and thirty-six, will enable them to accomplish all they have done during the past year; but they feel that the ultimate success of a Society of this sort will require a larger annual expenditure. The Council feel especially anxious to establish as soon as possible a good reference library. They also look forward with earnest hope of being able to found a reliable Anthropological Museum, and thus remove the disgrace under which this country is now suffering, that with all our colonial possessions no independent Anthropological Museum has yet been established in this Metropolis.

The Council are fully sensible of the important services which the officers of the Society have rendered during the past year, and they feel that it is their duty to again call on all the officers for renewed exertion during the ensuing year. The Council trust that the ample success which their efforts have met during the past year, will be an encouragement to the official representatives of the Council to again use their exertions to put the affairs of the Society in a permanently satisfactory state.

Signed on behalf of the Council,

JAMES HUNT, *Chairman*.

Mr. S. E. BOUVERIE PUSEY moved that the Report of Council be adopted, which was seconded by Mr. H. J. C. BEAVAN, and carried unanimously.

The PRESIDENT appointed Mr. J. REDDIE and Mr. H. J. C. BEAVAN scrutineers for the ballot, for the election of Officers and Council for 1864.

The PRESIDENT then delivered the annual address.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN,—A custom prevails amongst the chief scientific societies in the metropolis that the President should deliver an annual address. Believing such a course to be salutary to the well being of any society, I shall proceed to make such remarks as I think are suitable to the present occasion. The first year's existence of a scientific society is necessarily one not only of great hope, but also a period of great anxiety for those whose duty it is to see the objects of the society fully carried out.

When I addressed you at our first general meeting we had just

formed a Society, consisting of one hundred and twenty Fellows, but the plan proposed has yet to be tried before it could be decided whether the theory advanced was practicable. We shall now do well to review what we have done, with a view of seeing what still remains to be accomplished.

Every new plan is invariably met with certain objections, and our society has been no exception to this rule. We were told that our scheme was both impossible and impracticable. It was also boldly asserted that if we obtained members sufficient to carry out the objects of the Society, we could not obtain enough workers to do what was proposed. We were also told that existing societies with kindred objects could not get sufficient papers to be read at their meetings, and that our scheme must fail, from this if from no other reason. We were met with these and many other objections, frequently coming from men to whom we have a right to look both for support and encouragement; but experience has shown that these discouragements have no real existence. I will not detain you to show that each fancied defect in the constitution of our Society has been proved to be fallacious. I will merely ask you to recall what we have done as the most satisfactory answer to such objections.

We have also been obliged to hear the objects of the Society misrepresented, and have been told that we were antagonistic to existing institutions. On this point I think I shall do well to say a few words, as it might tend to put our position in a clearer light before those who have not yet really taken the trouble to inquire into the objects and aim of our society. In the first place, then, it is an erroneous idea to suppose that this Society is in any way antagonistic to any existing institution, or that there is any society in Great Britain which has ever attempted to carry out the objects for which we have united together. We are, indeed, trying to do something more than founding a new society; we are endeavouring to found a new science. We make bold to assert that no society has ever before attempted in this country to found a science of Man or Mankind. We have long had the different departments composing this science studied; but as long as they were isolated, so long could there be no real science of Mankind. The time has arrived when it has become absolutely necessary that all the different branches of science relating to man shall no longer be isolated, for we now see that it is necessary to bring all these branches together before we can make any real progress. It is our duty to use several sciences in founding our own. Just as the geologists have divided the different departments of their science into Geognosy, Palæontology, and Mineralogy, so the anthropologist sees the necessity of studying something more than Ethnology or the science of races, if he hoped to solve the problem of which that great branch of our science treats.

Many years ago the plan we have adopted would have been an impossibility. Archæology and Ethnology have hitherto been kept separate, to the great injury of both sciences. They both form an integral part of our science. We cannot be too careful to fully understand the meaning that we attach to our science, and, by so doing, we shall,

perhaps, be able to remove much of the misconception which exists respecting our objects and aims. The first attempt made to found such a science was in Paris, at the beginning of the present century; but it was a failure. It is only twenty-five years ago that a society was formed at Paris by William Edwards for the study of Ethnology. A few years later an Ethnological Society on exactly the same plan was formed in this metropolis. A similar society was, later still, formed at New York. The Ethnological Society of Paris consisted, at its height, of forty-six members. It still exists in name as one of the Paris societies, but has not published any memoirs since 1848. The London Ethnological Society, for the first two years of its existence, only consisted of twenty-one members. The second report of the Council announced that this number could not be increased. It has published altogether six volumes.

The Ethnological Society of New York consisted at one time of forty-four members. For some time it ceased to publish any Memoirs or proceedings; in 1856 a part of a volume was issued, but nothing has since appeared. Up to this time it has published two volumes.

It is now some four years ago since some zealous students of mankind became sensible of the unsatisfactory nature of existing institutions, and determined, with a wise appreciation of the vast extent of their science, to establish a society in Paris which should meet the requirements of the age, and that should help to establish a *de facto* science of man. Those who have watched the workings of this society must have become convinced that our scientific brethren in Paris have led the way to the formation of a science of man built on an extended and firm foundation. During the four years of their existence they have published nearly four volumes of Bulletins, and one volume of Memoirs. To the end of the first year there were only nineteen enrolled members, but they have been gradually increasing since then, and now we believe number nearly two hundred.* And now we come to a short year since, when we enrolled ourselves together to found a similar society in this me-

* M. Broca has kindly sent us the following details.

"We have at present one hundred and fifty-four subscribing members, liable to an annual subscription of 30 francs. These are:—112 living at Paris; 41 in the departments; 1 abroad—total, 154. When the last one, Professor Rizzetti, chief of the statistical department of Turin, was elected, the Society decided that its regulations did not preclude foreigners from becoming subscribing members; and this question, which had not previously been mooted, has been resolved very recently by a vote which took place prior to the nomination of M. Rizzetti.

"Our honorary members amount to the number of six; *i.e.* MM. Serres, Milne-Edwards, Boucher de Perthes, Renan, d'Avezac, and Littré.

"We have thirty-six associate and foreign members. Of these are:—England and Ireland, 14; Germany and Austria, 6; Switzerland, 4; Italy and Sicily, 2; America, 3; Spain, 1; Denmark, 1; Holland, 1; Belgium, 1; Russia, 3—36.

"We have, in fact, eighteen national correspondents, belonging for the most part to the army or the navy; and eight foreign correspondents, all established in America.

"Amongst the one hundred and twelve subscribing members living in Paris, we count eighty-four doctors of medicine.

tropolis. But the plan of our society is not a mere copy of our now sister society at Paris. On the contrary, a marked object of our society is the translation and printing of the most important works on Anthropology published on the continent. This alone is an immense and most important undertaking, and rendered it necessary that our numbers should be much larger than our sister society at Paris and than any other society which did not contemplate these important objects. We can barely yet be said to have existed one year, and we now number two hundred and thirty-six Fellows. This surely is a satisfactory beginning, and who will with such a fact again assert our undertaking to be impossible?

But the translation of foreign works is not the sole peculiarity of our Society. We contemplate the formation of an Anthropological Museum and a reference library for Anthropological students. We have barely yet commenced either of these undertakings, but yet specimens and books are gradually coming in, and by the end of another year let us trust that both our museum and our library will be in a flourishing state of existence.

On this subject I am well aware a very great difference of opinion prevails amongst men of science, and it is generally felt it is best to have no museum at all than a defective one, and that small museums are highly inconvenient, while large museums are only kept up at very great expense. These objections have been fully considered, and the council has been led to the determination to found a really useful, if not a large museum. The Anthropological Museum of Paris is perhaps the finest in the world, but this does not prevent our sister society there from also founding their own museum. Their success hitherto has been very great, and I trust we shall be able to make some exchanges with this society to our mutual advantage.

Our society have recently received the offer of a most desirable suite of apartments for a museum and library. This, if accepted, will incur a much larger annual expenditure than we now have; but if the present Fellows of the Society will individually assist to increase the number of our ranks with as little delay as possible, we should at once be able to establish our museum and library in one of the most desirable parts of London.

There is also a fourth peculiarity of our society which I should notice, and it is the plan of appointing local secretaries in different parts of the world, to act for the society in their districts in the same manner as our honorary secretaries act at home. When our plan with regard to our local secretaries is fully carried out, we shall have such a staff of officers in different parts of the world, that we shall not be long in obtaining a museum if we only give our officers permission to secure objects of importance for us. Not only will it be the duty of our local secretaries to obtain objects of interest and importance for our museum, but they will also send us an account of any new discoveries in their districts. I also trust that ere long some general questions will be sent to them on which we more particularly require information at this time. The efficacy of this plan will, of course,

very greatly depend on the gentlemen whom we appoint to these offices, and during the next year we shall be able to test this branch of our undertaking.

Having thus traced what has been done by other societies and what we propose to do, let me say a few words on the purely scientific aspects of our Society and on the position of Anthropology.

Let it, in the first place, be clearly understood that our society is not simply an Ethnological Society under another name, and that the name of our Society has a definite meaning which no amount of misrepresentation can ever take from it.

Anthropology includes every science which bears directly on the science of man or mankind, and includes Anatomy, Physiology, Psychology, Ethnography, Ethnology, Philology, History, Archæology and Palæontology as applied to man. Take either of these branches of science away, and we can no longer form a veritable science of man. But it may be asked, "Is it proposed to do the duty that is now attempted by societies that are devoted to some of the objects?" Certainly not; we only make use of these sciences so far as they will throw light on the past, the present, and the probable future of the human family. The philologist has hitherto been working in ignorance of the results of the physiologist; the historian in ignorance of the deduction of the ethnologist; and archæology and ethnography have hitherto been supposed to be two distinct sciences; while the psychologist and anatomist have had a mutual contempt for the deductions of each other. It is to remove these anomalies that we have formed ourselves together, with a determination of hearing all sides of the question, and examining the evidence of each special student in a perfectly unbiassed manner. No one who has devoted much serious attention to the study of man can doubt both the desirability and the necessity of thus bringing all the sciences relating to man together under one head. The departments may do well to go on working at their own branch, but it will greatly assist their inquiries to know of the discoveries that are making in other departments of science. Let it, therefore, be no longer said that we are wanting to split up science into different branches: for the contrary is the fact. We have seen—indeed we see clearly at this day—the injury that accrues to science from their forced separation; it is our object and desire to see them all united under one great science.

This, no doubt, is a vast scheme, and one which it will require many years to fully develop. But we see how well such a plan has answered in the Paris Anthropological Society.

M. Broca's brief and masterly summary of their labours during the last four years is already known to you, as M. Broca had the kindness to favour our official organ with a copy of this admirable address. There is, however, one important omission, and that is a detailed account of M. Broca's own communications. That *savant* has been the most active member of the society, and has contributed some of the most valuable memoirs that have been under its consideration, but with great modesty he has omitted to speak of them in his succinct summary of the labours of the society. I will only ask you to

look at the first volume of memoirs and at the four volumes of bulletins to see how well conceived the plan of the Paris Society was, and how admirable it has been carried out. Never before, indeed, has there been a society for the really scientific study of Man in all its branches. The *savants* of Paris felt that there could be no science of Man as long as ethnology was alone studied. In this country the same difficulty has been found, and our society has been created to supply this want. What rendered our society the more necessary was the vagueness attached to the word ethnology. Etymologically it means the Science of Nations, but by common usage it has been generally understood as the Science of Races. And yet one of the most learned ethnologists of the present day, Dr. R. G. Latham, declares that he has never used the word "race" in connection with Man in all his scientific writings, and professes himself unable to understand the meaning which is attached to that word. Thus we see the wonderful inconsistency of men calling themselves ethnologists, when they do not believe that such a science exists.

If ethnology means the Science of Races, then it is assuming that which yet has to be proved. Personally, I believe in the existence of races, and consequently that there is a science of ethnology; but how objectionable the word must be to those who do not believe in races can be easily conceived. In the word anthropology there is none of these gratuitous assumptions. It assumes nothing, and merely means the Science of Man or Mankind. Some men in this country have expressed themselves adverse to the introduction of what they please to call a new word in the language, and also have alleged that anthropology means exactly the same thing as ethnology. Both statements are equally erroneous. Anthropology is not a new word, nor does it mean at all the same thing as ethnology. In Germany, France, and even America, the word anthropology has long been introduced, and with exactly the same meaning which we attach to it. Indeed, I think I may affirm that there is at present not a scientific man of any eminence in either Germany, France or America who ever confuses the meaning of the two words, anthropology and ethnology. Dr. Latham, not believing in the existence of races, was obliged to give a meaning entirely his own to ethnology, and he gave a meaning equally faulty to the word anthropology. When Messrs. Nott and Gliddon, ten years ago, projected their book on the *Types of Mankind*, it was distinctly put forward as a work on "Anthropology", and it is not likely that the confusion which has hitherto reigned supreme in this country will be allowed to exist much longer. Our society has done much towards making known the true meaning to be attached to the word anthropology. A word that is wanted (even if new) always become easily and naturally acclimatised. In Paris there was no necessity to use any effort to popularise the meaning of the word; for the people have public instructors who are professors of anthropology.

During the past year we have seen how readily the public adopted what is erroneously called a new term. When it was reported that a fossil human jaw had been found at Abbeville, much public discus-

sion was excited, and it was at once asked to what branch of science ought this subject to be referred? Our society had only just come into existence, but it was at once seen that ours was the only existing society which could naturally take cognisance of such a discovery. The jaw itself was handed over to the professor of anthropology at the *Jardin des Plantes*, and the Paris Society of Anthropology, as well as ourselves, were called on to carefully consider the matter. Dr. Falconer in his letter speaks of the gentlemen whom he consulted on this subject as "both practised anthropologists", and no other word would have been suitable. The reputed fossil jaw will illustrate the necessity of our science. It belonged neither to the "Science of Races" or to "the relation of men to one another", but belonged essentially to the Science of Man. There can be no doubt, however, that up to the time this society was founded, a very vague and unsatisfactory meaning had been attached to the word anthropology. In translating it into English frequently the word ethnology was used as synonymous with anthropology. I will give one instance, which is a remarkable warning to others to avoid similar mistakes for the future. At the British Association at Manchester in 1861, a paper was read "On the Acclimatisation of Man", in which the following passage occurs, as a translation from M. Boudin. "The problem is certainly one of the most important in the science of ethnology". Now, if we turn to the original, we find the word *anthropologie* has been most unwarrantably translated ethnology. The only palliation I can offer for such a course is the fact that at the time this paper was read the word anthropology was not understood in this country. No one, however, is now more conscious of his error than the writer of that paper: for now some persons suppose that he thinks the question of the acclimatisation of man "is one of the most important in the science of ethnology," as he then asserted. But being myself the guilty person, I beg openly to acknowledge my error, and candidly assert that the question of the acclimatisation of man is not an ethnological subject, but essentially a question belonging to anthropology. It is not a question of races, but a question relating to mankind, whether composed of species, races, or varieties. In fact, there is, perhaps, no question in anthropology which requires so many different branches of science for its elucidation as the acclimatisation of man. 1. We must know the physiological changes which are produced by different climates. 2. The laws of hygiene or health. 3. Vital statistics. 4. The laws regulating the distribution of disease. 5. The influence of races in resisting disease; and, lastly, we require to know whether the conclusions which are derived from an investigation of the foregoing are supported by history, philology, and archæology.

This is only one illustration of very many which could be adduced to show that we can never have a science of mankind until we look on Man from every point of view.

Lord Stanhope, last year in his address to the Literary Fund, called attention to the large increase of scientific societies in this metropolis, which appeared to him to be a cause of regret. Now be this as it

may, there can be no doubt that the students of each science are the best judges as to what is required for the progress of their science. Our society aims rather at decreasing than increasing the number of scientific societies. Both the Ethnological and Philological Societies may perhaps eventually find that they can best advance their science in union with ourselves. Both these sciences form an integral part of the science of anthropology; but it must be left to time to decide whether those sciences can be best prosecuted under one head or separately. As Waitz will say, "There remains, unfortunately, a considerable gap in our knowledge; for these different branches of science stand yet side by side, unconnected, while they should by combination assist each other." But as Lord Stanhope has justly observed, it is the spirit of combination that is required in this country. The time will no doubt come when the ethnologists especially will see that a union with ourselves will be absolutely necessary if any advance is to be made in their science. On this point I cannot do better than quote from the philosophical address delivered to our sister society at Paris, by its accomplished Secretary-General, M. Paul Broca. He says: "To describe and classify the actual races, to point out their analogies and differences, to study their aptitudes and manners, to determine their filiation by blood and language, is no doubt to run over much ground in the field of anthropology; but there remain higher and more general questions. All the human races, in spite of their diversity, form a great whole, a great harmonic group; and it is important to examine the group in its *ensemble*, to determine its position in the series of beings, its relations with other groups of nature, its common characters, whether in the anatomical and physiological or in the intellectual order. It is not less necessary to study the laws which preside in maintaining or changing these characters, to appreciate the actions of external conditions, the changes of climate, the phenomena of hereditary transmission, and the extreme influences of consanguinity and ethnic intermixtures—these are great and manifold questions within the sphere of natural history and general biology. Finally, in a more elevated sphere, and without venturing to attain the regions which conceal the problem of origin (a fascinating and perhaps insoluble problem), our science eagerly searches for the first traces of man's appearance on the earth, it studies the most ancient remains of his industry, and gradually descending from incalculably remote epochs towards the historical period, it follows humanity in its slow evolution, in the successive stages of its progress, in its inventions, in its struggles with the organic world, and its conquests over nature."

It is to this combination that all our energies are directed, and ere long all earnest scientific ethnologists will, I trust, feel it their duty to aid us. We have witnessed the little progress that the Science of Man has made for want of this combination, and none can be more conscious of this than those who have studied ethnology. Indeed, as anthropologists we rejoice to see that our sister Ethnological society has elected as her President a gentleman who is so well known as a zealous anthropologist, and whose labours all tend to unite together

those twin brothers, Archæology and Ethnography. I need not say how we should welcome to our ranks all those who are really anxious for the progress of anthropological science. In the meantime our duty is clear; we have a great object before us in thus endeavouring to unite the various branches of science, and we can enter into no scheme which would prevent us from fully and carefully carrying them out in all its details. I cannot but trust and hope that the real friends of science will look at this matter from a purely scientific stand point, and that they will alone be influenced by what they believe to be the best for the progress of science. Whether or not the ethnologists of the country all join us, I hope we shall continue to look at their labours in no envious spirit, but rather that we should look at the progress and popularity of their science as the surest sign that our own science is destined to arrive at far more important truths, and that it will also eventually become far more popular.

Some have supposed that we merely entertain some philosophical speculations, and that the result of our inquiries can have no practical bearing on humanity. I need not waste time in showing how groundless such a charge is; for it appears to me that there is no science whose deductions can have a greater practical bearing on the well-being of humanity at large than the conclusions arrived at by Anthropologists.

Those who have narrowly watched, as I have done, the popular literature on Anthropology during the past year, must have become fully convinced of the absolute necessity of our Society. Many writers have, during the past year, complained, and not without reason, of the partial inductions which have been made by the ethnologist and the archæologist when speaking of the antiquity of man, and who have entirely ignored the teaching of the physiologist and the philologist, as well as the ancient historian. Why, they ask justly, should the evidence of ancient history be entirely passed over in silence? Why should it not have its true value in our deductions? These and similar questions have been put by popular writers on this subject, and they merit our special consideration. It has been well pointed out by a popular writer on this subject, that the deductions of the ethnologist are quite worthless when taken alone, and that we must especially interrogate physiology. This writer* puts the following questions:—

“How are the characters and physical properties of either parent, or both, transmitted to the child? How far does family likeness extend, and within what limits is it confined? What determines the sex, the full-grown stature, the complexion, and the whole physical constitution of the human offspring? Plainly it is not the choice of the parents. Is it a direct act of Divine sovereignty? Is it some law of physical sequence? If so, its nature and mode of operation are evidently quite unknown. Again, how far does the influence of climate upon the human frame extend? Does it increase in succes-

* Scientific Theories of the Origin of Man. Reprinted from the *Record* newspaper, 1863, p. 15.

sive generations or diminish? Has it power to assimilate within certain limits of natural congruity, being wholly powerless beyond them? or does it act by a simple graduation? In this case, does it affect most powerfully those who approach to the required type, or those who deviate most from it? Or does it act most upon those who are neither so unlike as to escape the range of its influence, and are thus incapable of acclimatisation, nor so nearly suited to the climate that little change is required to produce a perfect harmony? Once more, how far do famine and plenty, a scanty or a generous diet, habits of order and subjection to moral law, or a life barbarous and almost animal in its nature, influence the features and brain, and affect, in course of time, the very form of the skull, degrading it below the normal type of intelligent manhood? These are only a few of the questions which need to be answered, and answered with the greatest possible exactness, before any merely scientific theory on the diversity or unity of the human race can rise from a conjecture, more or less plausible, into a character of a fixed and demonstrable conclusion, drawn from the data of natural science alone."

Now to such questions as these we are bound to return a rational answer. We must no longer go on with reckless general assertions, but remember that all true science is built on the gradual accumulation of well ascertained facts. Any generalisation made from ethnology alone cannot have a scientific value. The same may be said of the deductions of the physiologist, the psychologist, the philologist, the historian, or the archæologist.

I cannot impress too strongly on the Society my conviction that it is just this combination which is at this time required, and of the necessity of hearing and carefully examining the evidence derived from different branches of science before we come to any conclusion on the origin and development of humanity.

If I were to pass under review what we have done to carry out the principles of such an undertaking as I have suggested, I feel it would not be entirely satisfactory to my own feelings. It cannot be denied that we have regularly issued to the Fellows a quarterly journal entirely devoted to the science of man. This is, I believe, the first instance of a quarterly journal ever having been issued entirely devoted to such a subject. So far we have cause for satisfaction, and I believe that this periodical has done a considerable amount of good in removing erroneous impressions, and in its columns are deposited many useful scientific facts of immense value to the future inquirer. Nor has its influence been confined to our own country, for not only has it been widely circulated throughout Europe, but in the antipodes its contents have been freely criticised. We are glad to find that scientific men of all countries are contributors to its pages, showing that it is devoted to no clique or party, but that it is the independent organ for all those who seek the truth. While, however, we patronise this quarterly, we are in no way responsible for its contents or its conduct. Our Journal is appended to it, and this is merely a mutual convenience which may cease any day, and which in no way implicates

the Society. Our Journal will, during this year, be very much larger, and perhaps ultimately absorb the whole publication. Be this as it may, none can doubt the value of the publication during the past year.

With regard to our meetings, we have also not yet been able to see, in all its particulars, the advantages of our plan; but those who have attended our meetings can judge of the large amount of interesting matter that has been elicited in our discussions, and of which, I am sorry to say, in many cases only an imperfect record exists. I shall not give a detailed examination of the various papers and Memoirs which have been read before us during the past year; but there is one class of papers which so well illustrates the necessity for our society, that I must briefly touch on them—I allude to the cases of microcephalic brains, which have been brought under our consideration. Our speculators on the origin of humanity have, nearly without exception, passed over the evidence to be derived from a study of these arrested brain-growths in nearly complete silence. Until we were established there was no society which could take cognisance of such cases. I will not now dwell on the deductions that may be made, because that is a matter of controversy, but express my satisfaction that we should have been the means of bringing to light one of the smallest cases of arrested brain-growth ever recorded, and the example set by our respected Fellow, Mr. R. T. Gore, has been the means of bringing to light other nearly equally interesting cases from other observers.

Twenty-four distinct papers have been read during the past year, and nearly the whole have been, or are now, printing. So far, then, there has been no indication of a want of material, perhaps rather the reverse is the case; but I hope to see during the ensuing year a larger number of carefully-prepared Memoirs than we have had during the past session. I have witnessed with much pleasure the gradual increase of workers which has taken place during the time we have been founded. I trust to see that number largely increased.

We must bear in mind that we are all students, and that each may do much good by devoting his attention to some special branch of inquiry. It is frequently asserted that the scientific conclusions of some inquirers differ from the conclusions of some other man who is presumed to be an "authority" on a special subject. But we shall do well to remember that in science we cannot recognise authority; for science must be founded on facts, and not on authorities, however great or venerable. It is only recently that we in England have already recognised this principle, and in this we are far behind our scientific brethren in France or Germany. It was only the other day I saw an allusion to our labours in a Dutch periodical, and the writer remarks, "We welcome this programme the more gladly, as it testifies that, *even* in England, they will no longer accept unscientific replies to anthropological questions." I trust the truth of this satire will now exist no longer.

I have thought it best to confine my remarks to the objects of our Society, and not to touch at length on the progress of Anthropology

in different parts of the world. I will simply remark, that never was there a year in which so many popular works on Anthropology were published. In this country, besides Waitz, we have had Sir C. Lyell's *Antiquity of Man*, Professor Huxley's *Man's Place in Nature*, Wilson's *Pre-Historic Man*, Jackson's *Ethnology and Phrenology*, and Brace's *Manual of Ethnography*, falsely called *Manual of Ethnology*. African Anthropology has been enriched with *Wanderings in West Africa*, Burton's *Abbeokuta*, Reade's *Savage Africa*, and Speke's *Journal*. These are a few of the most important works which have distinguished the year, besides our own *Journal*, and a volume of *Transactions* published by the Ethnological Society. In France there have been many important Memoirs read before the Paris Anthropological Society; but perhaps the most interesting and important is an elaborate *Memoir on the Human Hair*, by our Honorary Fellow, M. Pruner-Bey. I am glad to be able to announce that this important paper is about to appear at length in the next number of the *Anthropological Review*. I need not dwell on the other labours of the Paris Society, because they must already be known to the Fellows. We are also much indebted to our zealous secretary for the detailed account which he gave us of M. Desnoyers' discovery respecting the very great antiquity of man.

In Germany a fourth volume of Waitz's *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* has just appeared, while the learned author informs me that he is busily engaged on the fifth and concluding volume. M. Carl Vogt has issued a work, entitled *Vorlesungen über der Menschen, seine Stellung in der Schöpfung und in der Geschichte der Erde*. Professor Pott has given a work, entitled *Anti-Kaulen, oder Mythische Vorstellungen vom Ursprunge der Völker und Sprachen nebst Beurtheilung der zwei sprachwissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen Heinrich v. Ewald's*; while M. Welcker and Professor Lucae have published valuable Memoirs. In Italy Dr. Nicolucci has published two interesting Memoirs, and the *savants* of Sweden are just uniting to bring out an edition of the lamented Retzius' collected works.

I trust that during the year a translation of Vogt will be delivered to the Fellows, together with M. Broca's admirable work *On Human Hybridity*, and M. Pouchet's clever little work *On the Plurality of Human Races*.

Ere long, also, I hope to see the remaining volumes of Dr. Waitz's work given to the Society, under my friend Mr. Collingwood's painstaking editorship. It would also be most desirable to have an English version of Retzius's works, when we can find a gentleman willing and able to undertake its translation from the Swedish.

During the past year very many and entirely different subjects have been brought under our consideration. On another occasion I may perhaps review minutely what we have done. We have had one adjourned meeting, to discuss a paper, which I brought forward, on the Negro. I am glad to be able to announce that all the objections which were raised to this paper will be printed at length in the next number of the *Journal*. Some bigoted or dishonest writers in the public press have attempted to identify my opinions on the subject with those of the

Society. I need not attempt to reply to such a contemptible and groundless charge. But lest such an impression should exist in the mind of any intelligent person, I would just recall your attention to the fact that during the past year our Society has issued one of the most learned and forcible books ever published in this country on the other side of the question. Although, on some material points I differ very considerably from the views of Professor Waitz, I am none the less sensible of the value of his work to Anthropological students. I hope in future that the council will be guided entirely, in their selection of works for translation, by a desire to introduce useful books to the student, quite irrespectively of the views of the author. I trust, however, that no man of education will ever think of confounding the works published by the Society, or any paper read before us, as being in any way the view of the Society. If such opinions generally prevailed, there would be an end to all scientific discussion and liberty of thought. Such views, therefore, must either be the result of ignorance or of wilful misrepresentation; and when we see who makes these charges, or where they are made, we shall be enabled to judge from which cause they proceed.

I am glad to say that during the past year we have not wasted our time in discussing the origin of mankind. That subject is not ripe for our discussion, nor will it perhaps be for many years to come. There are very many subjects of the highest importance which we must decide before that problem can be solved.

There appears to me to be some subject which it would be well to occupy our attention during the ensuing session. In the first place, our knowledge of the geographical distribution of the ancient races of Man seems to me to be very defective, and I will suggest a profitable subject of inquiry—the Ethnography of the known world at the time of Herodotus. Is the distribution of the chief races the same now as then? Such a problem can alone be solved by the different branches of science which compose the great science of Anthropology. Let some Fellow also do for England what M. Paul Broca has done so well for France, and write us a Memoir on the Ethnology of England,—a subject on which, strange to say, we have at present no reliable information. At the beginning of the last session we appointed a committee to report on the terminology of Anthropological Science, but no report has been rendered, and it must be a matter of serious consideration with the next council of the Society whether it will be of any utility again to appoint such a committee. I would suggest that it would be desirable, if we again appoint a committee, that we should invite our sister Society in Paris to aid us in this important matter. As our parent society we have a right to look to her for aid, and I am sure we shall not look in vain; for during the past year we have had too many proofs of the good fellowship and friendly feeling of all the officers of that Society, as well as from other members. M. Quatrefages, the accomplished President, has kindly made frequent communications of his scientific labours, while M. Paul Broca and M. Pruner-Bey have most obligingly given us the continual benefit of their valuable services. We feel

that great benefit will accrue to science by thus working together, and eventually I hope we shall be able to make arrangements for an exchange of the use of our wood-cuts and lithographic plates.

And now, gentlemen, I have taken up so much of your time that I must not detain you much longer. I have briefly traced our past history, and what is the future in store for us? This will entirely depend on ourselves. If I do not mistake the signs of the times, however, a glorious future awaits our Society. The rapid increase of our numbers shows how well our objects are appreciated, and gives hope that at last the science of mankind shall indeed be studied with zeal and earnestness. The Geological Society, on which we have formed our rules, gives us a noble example of what may be done by real and zealous workers. Is there anything to prevent the Anthropological from becoming at least equal to the Geological Society? On the contrary, our science must ultimately be not only the most interesting, but also the most important. It is frequently the habit of scientific men to exaggerate the importance of their own special study to the detriment of other branches of knowledge; but do I exaggerate when I say that the fate of nations depends on a true appreciation of the science of anthropology? Are the causes which have overthrown the greatest of nations not to be resolved by the laws regulating the intermixture of the races of man? Does not the success of our colonisation depend on the deductions of our science? Is not the composition of harmonic nations entirely a question of race? Is not the wicked war now going on in America caused by an ignorance of our science? These and a host of other questions must ultimately be resolved by inductive science. The dreams of philosophers or of fanatics must all disappear before the light of true science. I well know we are far, very far, from being able to give decided answers to any of the questions I have suggested. But we see that all these questions must be resolved by the students of mankind. France has her professors of anthropology, and why not England? Geologists give medals to their successful students, and why should not anthropologists do the same? The Royal Society has its lectureships, and what is wanted but a good example, that we should have here established lectureships for the different branches of our science?

Some may consider these views visionary, but surely what is possible with one society is also possible for another. All we want now are workers who are conscious of the magnitude and importance of their science, and who are determined to go on with their work of accumulating facts and making deductions simply from these facts, entirely regardless of what conclusions they may arrive at.

For myself, I am but too conscious of my entire inability properly to discharge the high office of President to such an important Society. My time and talents—such as they are—are, however, at the entire disposal of the Fellows of the Society, in any capacity in which they may be found most useful, until this Society is in the flourishing state desired by its best friends.

Mr. S. E. COLLINGWOOD moved, "That the thanks of the Society be given to the President for his Address, and that it be printed;" which was seconded by Mr. TRAVERS, and carried unanimously.

Mr. G. WITT moved, "That the thanks of the Society be given to the retiring members of Council: Edward Pick, Esq., and Dr. J. Hughlings Jackson, for their services in the past year;" which was seconded by Dr. LISTER, and carried unanimously.

Mr. JAMES REDDIE moved, "That the thanks of the Society be given the President, Vice-Presidents, Officers, and Council for their services in the past year." He congratulated the Society on its present position, and called especial attention to the modest manner in which Dr. Hunt had alluded to his own labours, which had tended so materially to the service of the Society. He hoped that care would be taken that the *Anthropological Review*, which in one sense might be regarded as the child of the Society, although it was out in the world by itself, would be made as uniform in appearance as possible with the publications of the Society. He had much pleasure in moving this resolution, which, he felt certain, would be unanimously accepted.

Mr. J. SMITH seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously. Dr. HUNT, Mr. CARTER BLAKE, Mr. J. FRED. COLLINGWOOD, Mr. A. HIGGINS, and Mr. R. S. CHARNOCK, briefly acknowledged the honour conferred upon them.

Mr. BENDYSHE moved, "That the thanks of the Society be given to the Auditors," which was seconded by Mr. A. RAMSAY, Jun., and carried unanimously.

Mr. S. E. COLLINGWOOD, on the part of Mr. G. BYHAM and himself, briefly acknowledged the vote.

The Scrutineers brought up their Report, when it was announced that the following gentlemen were elected Officers and Council for the ensuing year:—*President*, Dr. James Hunt, F.S.A. *Vice-Presidents*, Captain Richard F. Burton; Sir Charles Nicholson, Bart.; the Duke of Roussillon. *Secretaries*, C. Carter Blake, Esq.; J. F. Collingwood, Esq. *Foreign Secretary*, Alfred Higgins, Esq. *Treasurer*, Richard S. Charnock, Esq. *Councillors*, T. Bendyshe, Esq.; W. Bollaert, Esq.; S. E. Collingwood, Esq.; Dr. George D. Gibb; H. Hotze, Esq.; J. Norman Lockyer, Esq.; S. E. Bouverie Pusey, Esq.; W. Winwood Reade, Esq.; George E. Roberts, Esq.; C. R. des Ruffières, Esq.; Dr. Berthold Seemann; W. Travers, Esq.; W. S. W. Vaux, Esq.; George Witt, Esq., F.R.S.

Mr. L. OWEN PIKE moved "That the thanks of the Society be given to the Scrutineers;" which was seconded by Mr. PETHERICK, and carried unanimously.

Mr. H. J. C. BEAVAN returned thanks.

Mr. CARTER BLAKE wished to call the attention of the Society to the state of the library, which now contained many most valuable works, and he hoped when a catalogue should be prepared, and when all the books which were in the library were properly stamped, the Fellows would enjoy the privilege of borrowing books under certain regulations. The especial object of his present remarks, however, was

to call the attention of the Society to the most valuable donation which Dr. Hunt had presented, consisting of 119 volumes, chiefly on African travel. This would form the nucleus of a library which would eventually prove of the highest value to Fellows, and he had much pleasure in moving "That the best thanks of the Society be given to Dr. Hunt for the liberal and valuable donation which he has presented to the Society's library."

Mr. G. WITT seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

Dr. HUNT, after thanking the Society, said that he had long felt the necessity that anthropologists should possess a good reference library, and that it gave him great pleasure to assist in its formation. He hoped that other members would feel an equal interest in the subject. The Royal Society of Literature had offered a desirable suite of apartments for a library and museum, and he hoped that the increase of members during the next few months would enable the Council to accept this offer.

The PRESIDENT then declared the proceedings to be at an end.

JANUARY 19TH, 1864.

JAMES HUNT, ESQ., PRESIDENT, IN THE CHAIR.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The following Fellows were elected: William Easse, Esq.; Henry Butler, Esq.; Philip Lybbe Powys Lybbe, Esq., M.P.; Robert C. Marsden, Esq.

The Extinction of Races. By RICHARD LEE, B.A., F.A.S.L., M.R.C.S.

The rapid disappearance of aboriginal tribes before the advance of civilisation is one of the many remarkable incidents of the present age. In every new country, from America to New Zealand, from Freemantle to Honolulu, it is observable, and seems to be a necessary result of an approximation of different races, peculiar, however, in degree, at least, to this portion of the world's history. It has been estimated that the Hawaiians have been reduced as much as eighty-five per cent. during the last hundred years. The natives of Tasmania are almost, if not quite, extinct. The Maories are passing away at the rate of about twenty five per cent. every fourteen years, and in Australia, as in America, whole tribes have disappeared before the advance of the white man.

Looking back into history, it would appear that such circumstances have not always been the consequence even of enduring oppression, still less of civilisation. Two millions of the Coptic race still testify to the inability of the ancient Eastern powers to destroy all remnants of the people they subdued. Egypt numbers a vast crowd of the lineal descendants of those men who fell before the Persian tyrant two thousand years ago; and, to come nearer home, the Celts, the Britons,